

A STABILITY INDEX FOR TRAVELING WAVES IN ACTIVATOR-INHIBITOR SYSTEMS

PAUL CORNWELL AND CHRISTOPHER K. R. T. JONES

ABSTRACT. We consider the stability of nonlinear traveling waves in a class of activator-inhibitor systems. The eigenvalue equation arising from linearizing about the wave is seen to preserve the manifold of Lagrangian planes for a nonstandard symplectic form. This allows us to define a Maslov index for the wave corresponding to the spatial evolution of the unstable bundle. We formulate the Evans function for the eigenvalue problem and show that the parity of the Maslov index determines the sign of the derivative of the Evans function at the origin. The connection between the Evans function and the Maslov index is established by a “detection form,” which identifies conjugate points for the curve of Lagrangian planes.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. The Evans Function	4
3. Symplectic Structure and the Plücker Coordinates	8
4. Symplectic Version of the Evans Function	10
5. The Maslov Index and Detection Form	12
6. Application	17
References	19

1. INTRODUCTION

The Maslov index is a half-integer topological invariant assigned to curves of Lagrangian planes. In recent years, it has been used to study the Morse index of linear operators in differential equations applications. In this work, we define the Maslov index for traveling waves in activator-inhibitor systems and show how it can be used to give spectral information about the wave. This is accomplished by recasting the Evans function in terms of the symplectic form defining the set of Lagrangian planes. Explicitly, we show that the parity of the Maslov index is the primary factor in determining the sign of the derivative of the Evans function at $\lambda = 0$. Employing differential forms, we prove this result entirely using an intersection-based theory of the Maslov index. We introduce a detection form, which is used to identify conjugate points for a curve of Lagrangian spaces. It is the detection form that allows us to bridge the gap from the Evans function to the Maslov index.

The relationship between the Maslov index and the Evans function was discovered by Chardard and Bridges [9]. That paper considered evolutionary PDE in which the time-independent part is a finite-dimensional Hamiltonian system in space. Among the systems in this class are reaction-diffusion equations with gradient nonlinearity. In that case, a homoclinic orbit represents a standing wave solution. The stability of such a wave is analyzed by linearizing about the solution and

formulating an Evans function $D(\lambda)$ to detect eigenvalues. Since $D(0) = 0$ due to translation invariance, the quantity $D'(0)$ provides important information for the stability analysis. Using a symplectic formulation of the Evans function, they were able to show that the sign of $D'(0)$ is determined by the so-called Lazutkin-Treschev invariant, an orientation index for codimension one intersections of Lagrangian planes. They then proved that the sign of this invariant is given by the parity of the Maslov index for the homoclinic orbit, and thus the Maslov index can be used to give the sign of $D'(0)$. This is a very important result, since the Maslov index is a geometric property of the wave itself related to its embedding in phase space. Our goal is to expand this result to a larger class of problems, namely traveling waves in activator-inhibitor systems.

The setting is systems of reaction-diffusion equations of the form

$$\begin{aligned} u_t &= u_{xx} + f(u) - \sigma v \\ v_t &= v_{xx} + g(v) + \alpha u, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$, and $x, t \in \mathbb{R}$ are space and time respectively. We assume that $f, g \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$, and that $\alpha, \sigma > 0$ are real constants. We assume that this system possesses a traveling wave solution, that is, a solution $\varphi = (\hat{u}, \hat{v})$ of one variable $z = x - ct$ that decays exponentially as $z \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Without loss of generality, we can take $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ as $z \rightarrow \pm\infty$. (Thus, $f(0) = g(0) = 0$.) Since this is the case for the example we consider in §6, we also assume that

$$c < 0, \tag{1.2}$$

which means that the wave is moving to the left. The work to follow does not depend on this assumption, but having $c > 0$ would change the ordering of some indices. We make one final assumption about the traveling wave, namely that it is given by the one-dimensional intersection of the stable and unstable manifolds of the fixed point 0. This is a natural assumption, since our goal is to determine the sign of the derivative of the Evans function at $\lambda = 0$, which is known to vanish if the wave is *not* constructed in this way [2].

One of the motivations for studying systems of this form is the so-called ‘‘Turing problem,’’ concerning pattern formation in reaction-diffusion equations. In his classic paper [34], Turing showed that the equilibrium $(u, v) = (0, 0)$ can be stable in the local reaction, but unstable when diffusion is added to the equation. This, in turn, can lead to the formation of patterns and has been invoked to explain patterns appearing in nature, such as stripes on a zebra [29]. However, this will happen only under certain circumstances. First, the system must be of *activator-inhibitor* type, meaning that Jacobian of the nonlinearity evaluated at $(0, 0)$ must have opposite signs on both its diagonal and off-diagonal terms. Also, the diffusivities of the two agents u and v must be significantly different. By taking the diffusion coefficients to be the same in (1.1) we hope to understand the mathematical implications of this assumption on the stability of traveling waves.

In light of the preceding discussion, we assume that f and g are such that the constant solution is stable without diffusion. The explicit conditions are determined by the trace and determinant of the Jacobian of the nonlinearity:

$$\begin{aligned} f'(0) + g'(0) &< 0 \\ f'(0)g'(0) + \sigma\alpha &> 0. \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

With the stated sign conventions on σ and α , we now see that (1.1) is an activator-inhibitor system, susceptible to diffusion-driven instability if the diffusivities were changed. (The signs of $f'(0)$ and $g'(0)$ do not affect what follows.) A fundamental issue in the study of reaction-diffusion equations is how the interplay between diffusion and the nonlinearity can create patterns, traveling waves, and other coherent structures. Equally important is the question of the stability of such structures, and the geometric techniques employed herein aim to shed light on this phenomenon.

For equations of the form (1.1), it is well known [4, 19] that proving φ is stable is tantamount to showing that the spectrum of the operator L arising from linearizing the traveling wave equation about φ is bounded away from the imaginary axis in the left half-plane. One can then set up the eigenvalue equation as a matrix system

$$Y'(z) = A(\lambda, z)Y(z), \quad \left(' = \frac{d}{dz} \right) \quad (1.4)$$

which allows for the use of geometrical dynamical systems techniques to locate eigenvalues. The classic tool in this pursuit is the Evans function, which is a Wronskian-type determinant that detects linear dependence between solutions that decay in backwards time with those that decay in forwards time. A useful exterior algebra formulation of this idea was introduced in [1], in which the former set is called the unstable bundle, and the latter the stable bundle, $E^u(\lambda, z)$ and $E^s(\lambda, z)$ respectively. The Evans function $D(\lambda)$ can then be defined as their wedge product (with appropriate scalings), and it enjoys several useful properties, to be enumerated later.

The key insight in this paper is that there is a symplectic form ω whose value on solutions can easily be tracked. In particular, the set of Lagrangian planes with respect to this form is invariant. We will show that the unstable bundle $E^u(\lambda, z)$ is ω -Lagrangian for any λ and z , and hence for fixed λ , the spatial evolution of the unstable bundle defines a curve in this set. The set of ω -Lagrangian planes is actually a manifold with cyclic fundamental group, and hence we can assign an index to curves in this space. This is the Maslov index, which will be defined for the traveling wave in §5.

As observed in [7, 8, 9], the Evans function can be recast as a “symplectic determinant” through the use of a natural volume form on a four-dimensional vector space. In §4, we give the corresponding formula for the activator-inhibitor case. This formula will allow us to connect the Maslov index to the Evans function, and hence to the stability of φ . Due to translation invariance, it is immediate that $D(0) = 0$. Furthermore, the wave is constructed as the maximally transverse intersection of stable and unstable manifolds if and only if $D'(0) \neq 0$. In this situation, the sign of $D'(0)$ can be key in obtaining spectral information about L , e.g. [24].

Now focusing on the $\lambda = 0$ case, we know that the unstable and stable manifolds are spanned by the derivative of the wave φ' and one other vector each. Suitably normalized, we have then that $E^s(0, z) = \text{sp}\{u_1(z), \varphi'\}$ and $E^u(0, z) = \text{sp}\{\varphi', u_4(z)\}$. In §4, we prove the primary result of this paper:

$$D'(0) = e^{cz}\omega(u_1, u_4) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{cz} \left(\frac{(\hat{u}')^2}{\sigma} - \frac{(\hat{v}')^2}{\alpha} \right) dz. \quad (1.5)$$

The expression $e^{cz}\omega(u_1, u_4)$, which is actually independent of z , is referred to in [9] as the *Lazutkin-Treschev* invariant of the wave. The integral in (1.5) can be calculated numerically if the wave is known, but the Lazutkin-Treschev invariant is more elusive. Briefly, the exponential weight can be distributed so that the solution u_1 approaches an eigenvector of the asymptotic matrix $A(0)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$. Along with the z -independence of $e^{cz}\omega(u_1, u_4)$, this can then be used to argue that u_4 (with the remaining weight) approaches another eigenvector of $A(0)$. However, the orientation of this latter eigenvector is unclear, which is vital in determining the sign of the symplectic form.

It turns out that the Maslov index, which measures the winding of the unstable bundle as it moves along the orbit, is the key to determining the sign of the Lazutkin-Treschev invariant. We will show in §5 that

$$(-1)^{\text{Maslov}(\varphi)+1} = \text{sign}(e^{cz}\omega(u_1, u_4)). \quad (1.6)$$

This is the analog of the result proved in [9], albeit with the opposite sign convention. The difficulty in treating activator-inhibitor systems lies in the fact that the operator obtained from linearizing

about the wave solution is not self-adjoint because the nonlinearity in (1.1) is not a gradient. As a consequence, its spectrum is not necessarily real, and the standard symplectic form is not preserved on solutions to the eigenvalue problem. Furthermore, we have a second obstruction to self-adjointness in the speed c . A major part of the analysis lies in determining the role of this parameter.

The topology of the set of Lagrangian planes—the *Lagrangian Grassmannian* $\Lambda(2)$ —is understood by realizing $\Lambda(2)$ as the homogeneous space $U(2)/O(2)$. In particular, the Maslov index can be related to the spectral flow of a family of unitary matrices representing a curve of subspaces. This approach is preferred in differential equations applications [10, 11, 21, 22, 23]. In [9] a variant of this approach due to Souriau is used in which the Maslov index is defined for elements in the universal cover of $U(n)$. There is an impediment to taking this perspective for activator-inhibitor systems owing to the fact that a non-standard symplectic form is used. To encode the Lagrangian planes in unitary matrices would require a change of variables in the eigenvalue equation, which would complicate calculating the Maslov index in practice.

Our approach uses an entirely intersection-based theory of the Maslov index, without any reference to unitary matrices. Using differential forms, we define a function β whose zeros give the dimension of crossings of $E^u(0, z)$ with the train of the stable subspace of the rest state. Derivatives of β can be related to the crossing form for intersections of curves of Lagrangian planes, which is in turn used to define the Maslov index. In addition to appealing directly to the intuitive idea of curves crossing hypersurfaces, the use of differential forms in this way is also instrumental in calculating the Maslov index in examples.

In another work [12], we use this framework to detect crossings of the train by the unstable bundle along fast-traveling waves in a FitzHugh-Nagumo system. Armed with additional information about the spectrum of L , we use (1.6) to prove that the fast waves of that system are stable. In singularly perturbed problems, it is common to see the Evans function factored into corresponding fast and slow functions via an “Elephant Trunk Lemma” argument [16]. Additionally, a derivative with respect to the speed parameter is often employed to make a transversality argument involving $D'(0)$, e.g. [24]. It is interesting to note that the Maslov index is an alternative to both of these approaches, since the fast-slow decomposition is used only to determine the contribution to the Maslov index along the different pieces of the orbit.

2. THE EVANS FUNCTION

Recasting (1.1) in a moving frame, one sees that a traveling wave is a steady state of

$$\begin{aligned} u_t &= u_{zz} + cu_z + f(u) - \sigma v \\ v_t &= v_{zz} + cv_z + g(v) + \alpha u. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

The steady state equation is an ODE, which upon setting $u_z = \sigma w$ and $v_z = \alpha y$, can be written as the first order system

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \\ w \\ y \end{pmatrix}_z = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma w \\ \alpha y \\ -cw - \frac{f(u)}{\sigma} + v \\ -cy - u - \frac{g(v)}{\alpha} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.2}$$

As explained in §2.A of [1], equation (2.1) can be solved for small t in the space $BU(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^2)$ of bounded, uniformly continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}$, so this is a natural space to consider for the stability analysis. In that work, assumptions are also made on the decay rates of the wave in its tails. We will see that this condition is satisfied here, since the fixed point $(0, 0)$ of the steady state equation is hyperbolic. We use the following definition for nonlinear stability.

Definition 1. The traveling wave $\varphi(z)$ is **asymptotically stable** relative to (2.1) if there is a neighborhood $V \subset BU(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^2)$ of $\varphi(z)$ such that if $u(z, t)$ solves (2.1) with $u(z, 0) \in V$, then

$$\|\varphi(z + k) - u(z, t)\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for some $k \in \mathbb{R}$.

As advertised, it suffices to prove that the wave is spectrally stable. We linearize (2.1) about the traveling wave φ to obtain

$$P_t = P_{zz} + cP_z + \begin{pmatrix} f'(\hat{u}) & -\sigma \\ \alpha & g'(\hat{v}) \end{pmatrix} P, \quad (2.3)$$

with $P = (p, q)^T \in BU(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^2)$. The right-hand-side of (2.3) defines the operator L through its action on P . The spectrum $\sigma(L)$ of L is then broken into two parts. First, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ is an eigenvalue for L if there exists a bounded solution P to the equation

$$LP = \lambda P. \quad (2.4)$$

The set of eigenvalues of finite multiplicity is called the point spectrum $\sigma_n(L)$ of L , and the complement of this set in $\sigma(L)$ is called the essential spectrum $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(L)$. Equation (2.4) is a second-order system of two equations, which can be converted to a four-dimensional first-order system using the standard trick. This allows us to analyze the eigenvalue problem using geometrical dynamical systems methods. To that end, set $p_z = \sigma r$ and $q_z = \alpha s$ to get

$$\begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \\ r \\ s \end{pmatrix}_z = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \sigma & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha \\ \frac{\lambda}{\sigma} - \frac{f'(\hat{u})}{\sigma} & 1 & -c & 0 \\ -1 & \frac{\lambda}{\alpha} - \frac{g'(\hat{v})}{\alpha} & 0 & -c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \\ r \\ s \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.5)$$

This is now in the familiar form

$$Y' = A(\lambda, z)Y, \quad (2.6)$$

where $Y(\lambda, z) = (p, q, r, s) \in \mathbb{C}^4$ and $A(\lambda, z) \in M_4(\mathbb{C})$ is the complex matrix

$$A(\lambda, z) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \sigma & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha \\ \frac{\lambda}{\sigma} - \frac{f'(\hat{u})}{\sigma} & 1 & -c & 0 \\ -1 & \frac{\lambda}{\alpha} - \frac{g'(\hat{v})}{\alpha} & 0 & -c \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.7)$$

Since $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \rightarrow (0, 0)$ exponentially as $z \rightarrow \pm\infty$, it follows that

$$A(\lambda, z) \rightarrow A(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \sigma & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha \\ \frac{\lambda}{\sigma} - \frac{a}{\sigma} & 1 & -c & 0 \\ -1 & \frac{\lambda}{\alpha} - \frac{b}{\alpha} & 0 & -c \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.8)$$

where $a = f'(0)$ and $b = g'(0)$, and this convergence is exponential as well.

The asymptotic matrix $A(\lambda)$ plays a prominent roll in the behavior of solutions to (2.6). In particular, if $A(\lambda)$ has no purely imaginary eigenvalues, then (2.6) admits an exponential dichotomy [32], and hence we can pick out solutions that decay at either plus or minus infinity. The essential spectrum of L is precisely the set of λ for which $A(\lambda)$ has neutral eigenvalues. Fortunately, in the activator-inhibitor case this set is bounded away from the imaginary axis in the left half-plane.

Lemma 1. There exists $K > 0$ such that for the operator L defined by (2.3), we have

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(L) \subset \mathcal{K} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Re } z \leq K\}. \quad (2.9)$$

Furthermore, $A(\lambda)$ has exactly two eigenvalues of positive real part and two of negative real part for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{K}$.

Proof. Since L is known to be sectorial [19], it suffices to show that σ_{ess} is disjoint from the closed right half-plane. For fixed $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, the characteristic polynomial of $A(\lambda)$ is

$$\chi_{A(\lambda)}(t) = t^4 + 2ct^3 + (c^2 + a + b - 2\lambda)t^2 + c(a + b - 2\lambda)t + ab - \lambda(a + b) + \lambda^2 + \sigma\alpha. \quad (2.10)$$

Set $\lambda = x + iy$. Then $\lambda \in \sigma_{\text{ess}(L)}$ if and only if $A(\lambda)$ has at least one neutral eigenvalue, which is to say that $\chi_{A(\lambda)}(ik) = 0$ for some $k \in \mathbb{R}$. We substitute these values into $\chi_{A(\lambda)}$ and collect the real and imaginary parts:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re } \chi_{A(\lambda)}(ik) &= \left(x + k^2 - \left(\frac{a+b}{2} \right) \right)^2 - (y - ck)^2 - \frac{1}{4}(a-b)^2 + \sigma\alpha \\ \text{Im } \chi_{A(\lambda)}(ik) &= (ck - y)(-2k^2 + a + b - 2x). \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

From the first equation in (1.3), it follows that for $x \geq 0$, the second equation in (2.11) vanishes only when $y = ck$. Substituting this value into the first equation, we end up with

$$\text{Re } \chi_{A(x+ick)}(ik) = k^4 - (a + b - 2x)k^2 + x^2 - (a + b)x + \alpha\sigma + ab. \quad (2.12)$$

This even quartic has a real solution k for nonnegative x if and only if the constant term is nonpositive. But the constant term is a quadratic in x , which is positive for $x \geq 0$, by (1.3). The second claim follows from examining (2.7) for real $\lambda \gg 1$ and noticing that changes in the eigenvalue split occur only when λ crosses σ_{ess} . $\square$

The preceding lemma guarantees that we can define the Evans function [1, 24, 32] in an open, simply connected domain $\mathcal{U}$ containing the closed right half-plane $\bar{H}^+$. We follow the strategy of [1] and define the Evans function using stable and unstable bundles, $E^s(\lambda, z)$ and $E^u(\lambda, z)$. System (2.6) induces an equation

$$Z' = A^{(2)}(\lambda, z)Z, \quad (2.13)$$

on $\bigwedge^2(\mathbb{C}^4)$. Explicitly, $A^{(2)}(\lambda, z)$ is the unique endomorphism of $\bigwedge^2(\mathbb{C}^4)$ satisfying

$$A^{(2)}(\lambda, z)(Y_1 \wedge Y_2) = A(\lambda, z)Y_1 \wedge Y_2 + Y_1 \wedge A(\lambda, z)Y_2 \quad (2.14)$$

for any $Y_{1,2} \in \mathbb{C}^4$. It follows that if Y_i are solutions to (2.6), then $Y_1 \wedge Y_2$ is a solution to (2.13). The eigenvalues of the matrix $A^{(2)}(\lambda) = \lim_{z \rightarrow \pm\infty} A^{(2)}(\lambda, z)$ are the pairwise sums of eigenvalues of $A(\lambda)$, so for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{U}$ we have a simple eigenvalue of largest (positive) real part and a simple eigenvalue of least (negative) real part, by Lemma 1. Let $\mu_i(\lambda)$, $i = 1 \dots 4$ be the four eigenvalues of $A(\lambda)$, ordered by increasing real part. As in [1], we have solutions $E^s(\lambda, z)$ and $E^u(\lambda, z)$ to (2.13) satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-(\mu_1(\lambda) + \mu_2(\lambda))z} E^s(\lambda, z) &\rightarrow \zeta_s(\lambda) \text{ as } z \rightarrow \infty \\ e^{-(\mu_3(\lambda) + \mu_4(\lambda))z} E^u(\lambda, z) &\rightarrow \zeta_u(\lambda) \text{ as } z \rightarrow -\infty, \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

where ζ_u and ζ_s are eigenvectors of $A^{(2)}(\lambda)$, depending analytically on λ [27]. Furthermore, these solutions are themselves analytic in λ , and the convergence is uniform in z on compact subsets of $\mathcal{U}$. The wedge product $E^s(\lambda, z) \wedge E^u(\lambda, z)$ is in the one-dimensional space $\bigwedge^4(\mathbb{C}^4)$, and it satisfies the equation

$$W' = \text{Trace}(A(\lambda, z))W. \quad (2.16)$$

Since $\text{Trace}(A(\lambda, z)) \equiv -2c$, it follows that

$$\tilde{D}(\lambda) = e^{2cz} E^s(\lambda, z) \wedge E^u(\lambda, z) \quad (2.17)$$

is independent of z . This is the Evans function, as defined in [1]. The four-form in the definition of $\tilde{D}$ is proportional to the standard volume form, so for matters of convenience, we will define the Evans function to be the scalar part.

Definition 2. *The **Evans function** $D(\lambda)$ is defined by*

$$D(\lambda)\text{vol} = e^{2cz} E^s(\lambda, z) \wedge E^u(\lambda, z). \quad (2.18)$$

This function has the usual properties of the Evans function defined in [1]. In particular, it is analytic on $\mathcal{U}$ and vanishes for all values of λ that are eigenvalues of L , with the order of the zero giving the algebraic multiplicity of the eigenvalue. Henceforth, the discussion will be tailored to the case $\lambda = 0$. Since σ_{ess} is a closed set, we know there is an interval $I = [-\delta, \infty) \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $\delta > 0$ contained in $\mathcal{U}$. The eigenvalues of $A(\lambda)$ are seen to be

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(\lambda) &= -\frac{c}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{c^2 - 2(a+b) + 4\lambda + 2\sqrt{(a-b)^2 - 4\alpha\sigma}} \\ \mu_2(\lambda) &= -\frac{c}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{c^2 - 2(a+b) + 4\lambda - 2\sqrt{(a-b)^2 - 4\alpha\sigma}} \\ \mu_3(\lambda) &= -\frac{c}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{c^2 - 2(a+b) + 4\lambda - 2\sqrt{(a-b)^2 - 4\alpha\sigma}} \\ \mu_4(\lambda) &= -\frac{c}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{c^2 - 2(a+b) + 4\lambda + 2\sqrt{(a-b)^2 - 4\alpha\sigma}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

with associated eigenvectors

$$\eta_i(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha\sigma \\ \alpha(\mu_i^2 + c\mu_i - (\lambda - a)) \\ \alpha\mu_i \\ \mu_i(\mu_i^2 + c\mu_i - (\lambda - a)) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.20)$$

(The λ dependence of μ_i is suppressed.) For $\lambda \in I$, whether these eigenvalues are real or simple is entirely determined by the nonlinearity in (1.1). Indeed, notice that $(a-b)^2 - 4\alpha\sigma = (a+b)^2 - 4(ab + \alpha\sigma)$, which is the discriminant Δ of the characteristic polynomial for the linearization of the reaction term about zero. One can see from (1.3) that each μ_i is real for all $\lambda \in I$ if $\Delta > 0$. If $\Delta < 0$, then the positive and negative real part eigenvalues will each come in a conjugate pair. Finally, if $\Delta = 0$, then there are two real double eigenvalues, one positive and one negative. The latter case complicates the ability to choose analytically varying basis vectors for the bundles, see [8], so we assume that $\Delta \neq 0$. If $\Delta < 0$, then it is shown in [17] that $D(\lambda)$ can be taken real for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, so what follows would go through unharmed. However, it would require a slightly different presentation, so we therefore assume that $\Delta > 0$. This is tantamount to assuming that the tails of the traveling wave are monotone as opposed to oscillatory.

Under this assumption, for $\lambda \in I$ we have four eigenvalues

$$\mu_1(\lambda) < \mu_2(\lambda) < 0 < \mu_3(\lambda) < \mu_4(\lambda). \quad (2.21)$$

Since each of these is simple, there are corresponding solutions $u_i(\lambda, z)$ to (2.6) satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\mu_i(\lambda)z} u_i(\lambda, z) &= \eta_i(\lambda), \quad i = 1, 2 \\ \lim_{z \rightarrow -\infty} e^{-\mu_i(\lambda)z} u_i(\lambda, z) &= \eta_i(\lambda), \quad i = 3, 4. \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

The u_i are analytic in λ and converge uniformly in z for λ in compact subsets of $\mathcal{U}$. Finally, the chosen scaling guarantees that

$$\begin{aligned} E^s(\lambda, z) &= u_1(\lambda, z) \wedge u_2(\lambda, z) \\ E^u(\lambda, z) &= u_3(\lambda, z) \wedge u_4(\lambda, z). \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

Generically, traveling waves will decay at the rates of the leading stable and unstable eigenvalues as z approaches ∞ and $-\infty$ respectively [20]. For definiteness, we take this to be the case. We therefore have

$$\varphi'(z) = u_2(0, z) = u_3(0, z). \quad (2.24)$$

Strictly speaking, φ' may approach (with the appropriate exponential scaling) another multiple of $\eta_2(0)$ (resp. $\eta_3(0)$) as $z \rightarrow \infty$ (resp. $-\infty$). This will be important in §5, but we postpone the issue for the time being.

3. SYMPLECTIC STRUCTURE AND THE PLÜCKER COORDINATES

In the previous section, the stable and unstable bundles were defined as functions into the 2nd exterior power $\Lambda^2(\mathbb{C}^4)$, or $\Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ for real λ . Via the Plücker embedding, they can also be interpreted as the evolution of linear subspaces under the flow of the eigenvalue equation (2.6). In the special case $\lambda = 0$, the eigenvalue equations are just the equation of variations for (2.2) along the traveling wave. Thus $E^u(0, z)$ is the (two-dimensional) tangent space to the unstable manifold $W^u(0)$ of the fixed point $(0, 0, 0, 0)$ at the point $\varphi(z)$. Now, consider (2.13), with $\lambda \in I$. Let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^4$ be the standard basis for $\mathbb{R}^4$. To any plane $V = \text{sp}\{u, v\} \in \text{Gr}_2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ ($u = \sum_{i=1}^4 u_i e_i$, e.g.) we can associate a two vector $u \wedge v$, which can be expressed in terms of the basis $\{e_i \wedge e_j\}$ of $\Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$. Explicitly, the $e_i \wedge e_j$ -coordinate—call it p_{ij} —is given by

$$p_{ij} = \begin{vmatrix} u_i & v_i \\ u_j & v_j \end{vmatrix}. \quad (3.1)$$

Choosing a different basis of V would change this two-vector by a non-zero constant multiple, so by projectivizing, one obtains a well-defined map $j : \text{Gr}_2(\mathbb{R}^4) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^4)$. It can be shown [18] that this map is an embedding, and its image is a projective variety. For any plane V , we call $j(V) = (p_{12}, p_{13}, p_{14}, p_{23}, p_{24}, p_{34})$ the *Plücker coordinates* for V . These coordinates are really projective, but it will nonetheless be useful to think of a plane as a vector in $\mathbb{R}^6$.

It is important to note that the map j is not surjective—it is explained in [18] that only points satisfying the *Grassmannian condition*

$$p_{12}p_{34} - p_{13}p_{24} + p_{14}p_{23} = 0 \quad (3.2)$$

are in the image of the embedding. In what follows, we freely identify planes with their images under j . Before proceeding, it will be helpful to write down the matrix for $A^{(2)}$ using Plücker coordinates. Let $Y_1 = (p, q, r, s)$ and $Y_2 = (\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}, \tilde{r}, \tilde{s})$ be solutions of (2.6), such that $j(\text{sp}\{Y_1, Y_2\}) = (p_{ij})$. Then, using (2.6) and (3.1),

$$p'_{12} = (p\tilde{q} - \tilde{p}q)' = \sigma r\tilde{q} + \alpha p\tilde{s} - \sigma \tilde{r}q - \alpha \tilde{p}s = -\sigma(q\tilde{r} - r\tilde{q}) + \alpha(p\tilde{s} - \tilde{p}s) = -\sigma p_{23} + \alpha p_{14}.$$

The other derivatives are computed similarly, and we end up with

$$\begin{pmatrix} p_{12} \\ p_{13} \\ p_{14} \\ p_{23} \\ p_{24} \\ p_{34} \end{pmatrix}' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \alpha & -\sigma & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -c & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\lambda - g'(\hat{v})}{\alpha} & 0 & -c & 0 & 0 & \sigma \\ \frac{f'(\hat{u}) - \lambda}{\sigma} & 0 & 0 & -c & 0 & -\alpha \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -c & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \frac{\lambda - f'(\hat{u})}{\sigma} & \frac{g'(\hat{v}) - \lambda}{\alpha} & 1 & -2c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p_{12} \\ p_{13} \\ p_{14} \\ p_{23} \\ p_{24} \\ p_{34} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.3)$$

Now, one can verify directly that

$$\frac{d}{dz} (p_{12}p_{34} - p_{13}p_{24} + p_{14}p_{23}) = 0 \quad (3.4)$$

for any nonzero solution $Y_1(\lambda, z) \wedge Y_2(\lambda, z)$ of (2.13). This is to be expected, since the flow of a linear ODE preserves the dimension of subspaces. Nonetheless, this suggests that a good way to find invariant subsets of $\text{Gr}_2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ for (2.13) is to find algebraic quantities that are preserved. For example, we have the following.

Lemma 2. *The set of planes satisfying $p_{13} - p_{24} = 0$ is invariant under the flow of (2.13).*

Proof. A direct computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} (p_{13} - p_{24})' &= p_{12} - cp_{13} - (p_{12} - cp_{24}) \\ &= -c(p_{13} - p_{24}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

The result follows from the uniqueness of solutions to ODEs. $\square$

It is worth noting that equations like (3.2) and (3.5) make sense because the polynomials are homogeneous. They therefore define projective varieties, which are identified with subsets of $\text{Gr}_2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ by j . The degree of the polynomial in Lemma 2 is one, and it is called a linear line complex, see §1.11 of [14]. It turns out that the subsets of $\text{Gr}_2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ cut out by a linear line complex have one of two different structures. To distinguish between them, it is useful to talk about differential forms.

Consider the dual space to $\bigwedge^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$, identified with $\bigwedge^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ in the standard way. Elements of this space can be identified with two-forms on $\mathbb{R}^4$, see [35], page 315. Explicitly, the element dual to $e_i \wedge e_j \in \bigwedge^2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ is identified with $de_i \wedge de_j$, which acts on two vectors in $\mathbb{R}^4$. We can therefore think of the Plücker embedding as identifying two-planes in $\mathbb{R}^4$ with differential two-forms (again, defined up to a nonzero multiple). With this interpretation, when $\lambda = 0$, $\frac{d}{dz}$ becomes the Lie derivative of the form along the vector field tangent to the homoclinic orbit.

Since differential two-forms are skew-symmetric, any (non-trivial) two-form on $\mathbb{R}^4$ has either a two- or zero-dimensional kernel. In light of Lemma 2, we define

$$\omega = de_1 \wedge de_3 - de_2 \wedge de_4. \tag{3.6}$$

It is not difficult to see that ω is nondegenerate, hence it is a symplectic form. Furthermore, for any plane $V = (p_{ij}) \in \text{Gr}_2(\mathbb{R}^4)$, we have

$$p_{13} - p_{24} = 0 \iff \omega|_V = 0. \tag{3.7}$$

It follows that the invariant set $p_{13} - p_{24} = 0$ is the set of Lagrangian planes for ω . A subspace $V \in \text{Gr}_2(\mathbb{R}^4)$ is called *Lagrangian* if $\omega(v_1, v_2) = 0$ for all $v_i \in V$. The set of Lagrangian planes is actually a differentiable manifold of dimension 3, called the Lagrangian Grassmannian $\Lambda(2)$, and it is a homogeneous space $U(2)/O(2)$. (See [3], for example.) It can be shown that $\pi_1(\Lambda(2)) = \mathbb{Z}$, which allows us to define a winding number for curves in this space. This winding number is called the Maslov index, which will be discussed in §5. First, we prove the crucial result that the stable and unstable bundles are Lagrangian.

Theorem 1. *Both $E^s(\lambda, z)$ and $E^u(\lambda, z)$ are Lagrangian subspaces for all λ and z .*

Proof. Define another symplectic form Ω by

$$\Omega(a, b) = e^{cz}\omega(a, b). \tag{3.8}$$

Clearly, $E^{u/s}(\lambda, z)$ is ω -Lagrangian if and only if it is Ω -Lagrangian for any z . Furthermore, $\Omega(u_i(\lambda, z), u_j(\lambda, z))$ is independent of z for any i, j , which can be seen from the proof of Lemma 2 and the ensuing discussion of differential forms. For the stable bundle, we see that

$$\Omega(u_1, u_2) = \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} e^{cz}\omega(u_1(\lambda, z), u_2(\lambda, z)) = 0,$$

since $c < 0$ and $u_{1,2}$ decay exponentially in forward time for all λ . For the unstable bundle, notice that $\mu_3 + \mu_4 > -c$ for all λ , so

$$e^{cz}\omega(u_3, u_4) = e^{(c+\mu_3+\mu_4)z}\omega(e^{-\mu_3 z}u_3, e^{-\mu_4 z}u_4) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } z \rightarrow -\infty,$$

since the exponential in front has a positive exponent, and the arguments of ω are bounded. In both cases, Ω is identically zero, so ω must be as well. $\square$

A byproduct of this proof is that $\omega(\eta_1, \eta_2) = \omega(\eta_3, \eta_4) = 0$, since one can scale ω in any way without changing that the form is 0. It can also be verified directly that $\omega(\eta_1, \eta_3) = \omega(\eta_2, \eta_4) = 0$, but that $\omega(\eta_1, \eta_4)$ and $\omega(\eta_2, \eta_3)$ are *not* zero. These facts will be important later.

We close this section by addressing the orientation of the stable and unstable bundles. Take $\lambda = 0$ in (2.13). On the one hand, we know from (2.6) that $E^u(0, z) = u_3(0, z) \wedge u_4(0, z)$ solves (2.13) and satisfies the asymptotic condition

$$e^{-(\mu_3(0)+\mu_4(0))z}u_3(0, z) \wedge u_4(0, z) \rightarrow \eta_3(0) \wedge \eta_4(0) \text{ as } z \rightarrow -\infty. \quad (3.9)$$

On the other hand, we see from (2.15) and (2.23) that

$$e^{-(\mu_3(0)+\mu_4(0))z}u_3(0, z) \wedge u_4(0, z) \rightarrow \zeta_u(0) \text{ as } z \rightarrow -\infty. \quad (3.10)$$

It follows that $\zeta_u(0) = \eta_3(0) \wedge \eta_4(0)$. As noted at the end of the previous section, it will be convenient to take $u_3 = \varphi'$ for $\lambda = 0$, in which case the unstable bundle will approach a nonzero multiple of $\zeta_u(0)$ in the limit. To compensate, we can replace $u_4(0, z)$ with a multiple of itself, so that indeed

$$e^{-(\mu_3(0)+\mu_4(0))z}\varphi'(z) \wedge u_4(0, z) \rightarrow \zeta_u(0) \text{ as } z \rightarrow -\infty. \quad (3.11)$$

We can treat the stable bundle in the same way to ensure that

$$e^{-(\mu_1(0)+\mu_2(0))z}u_1(0, z) \wedge \varphi'(z) \rightarrow \zeta_s(0) = \eta_1(0) \wedge \eta_2(0) \text{ as } z \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.12)$$

With this convention in place, the Lazutkin-Treschev invariant truly gives a sign to the homoclinic orbit. The Maslov index will be used to determine this sign.

4. SYMPLECTIC VERSION OF THE EVANS FUNCTION

Recall that for $\lambda \in I$, we can pick out spanning solutions $u_i(\lambda, z)$ for the stable and unstable bundles. This allows us to rewrite the Evans function

$$\begin{aligned} D(\lambda)\text{vol} &= e^{2cz}E^s(\lambda, z) \wedge E^u(\lambda, z) = e^{2cz}u_1(\lambda, z) \wedge u_2(\lambda, z) \wedge u_3(\lambda, z) \wedge u_4(\lambda, z) \\ &= e^{2cz}\det[u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4]\text{vol}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

In order to exploit the symplectic structure of the preceding section in the Evans' function analysis, we need to rewrite $D(\lambda)$ in terms of the symplectic form. This idea was pioneered in [6, 7] for systems of Hamiltonian PDEs with a multi-symplectic structure, and the following formula first appeared in [9]. The slight difference in our formula and that of Chardard-Bridges' is due to the fact that the symplectic form is different in activator-inhibitor systems.

Theorem 2. *Let $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}^4$. Then*

$$\det[a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2] = -\det \begin{bmatrix} \omega(a_1, b_1) & \omega(a_1, b_2) \\ \omega(a_2, b_1) & \omega(a_2, b_2) \end{bmatrix} + \omega(a_1, a_2)\omega(b_1, b_2). \quad (4.2)$$

This formula is proved for arbitrary (even) dimension in [9] using the Leibniz formula for determinants. However, in this low-dimensional case it is easy enough to verify using brute force. Notice that the second term in (4.2) disappears if either $\text{sp}\{a_1, a_2\}$ or $\text{sp}\{b_1, b_2\}$ is a Lagrangian plane. Combining (4.1) and (4.2), we arrive at the symplectic Evans function.

Corollary 1. *The symplectic Evans function is*

$$D(\lambda) = -e^{2cz} \det \begin{bmatrix} \omega(u_1, u_3) & \omega(u_1, u_4) \\ \omega(u_2, u_3) & \omega(u_2, u_4) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.3)$$

In this form, it is easy to see the z -independence of D . Distributing one copy of e^{cz} to each row of the matrix in (4.3), one can replace $e^{cz}\omega$ with Ω in each entry.

Let us now consider the case $\lambda = 0$. First, due to translation invariance, the derivative of the traveling wave $\varphi'(z)$ is a zero-eigenfunction for L , hence $D(0)$ should be zero. Indeed, from (2.24) we have $\varphi' = u_2(0, z) = u_3(0, z)$. From Theorem 1, it follows that each entry of the matrix in (4.3) is zero, with the possible exception of $\omega(u_1, u_4)$. Thus $D(0) = 0$, as expected. Corollary 1 can also be used to show that $D'(0) = 0$ if the stable and unstable bundles have a two-dimensional intersection (i.e. they coincide). In this case, the matrix in (4.3) is the zero matrix for $\lambda = 0$, and an application of the product rule shows that $D'(0) = 0$.

The main result of this paper involves $D'(0)$, so we start by calculating this using Jacobi's formula. The second part of this calculation is inspired by [30], and similar calculations are carried out in [7, 8].

Lemma 3. *The quantity $D'(0)$ is given by*

$$D'(0) = \Omega(u_1, u_4) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{cz} \left(\frac{(\hat{u}')^2}{\sigma} - \frac{(\hat{v}')^2}{\alpha} \right) dz. \quad (4.4)$$

Before giving the proof, a few comments are in order. First, the fact that the wave is transversely constructed implies that both expressions in (4.4) are nonzero. The integral depends solely on the wave itself, and this will be calculable. The term $\Omega(u_1, u_4)$ on the other hand—the Lazutkin-Treschev invariant—carries information about the intersection of the stable and unstable manifolds. The decay rates of the u_i and the z -independence of Ω can be used to show that $e^{-\mu_4(0)z}u_4(0, z)$ converges to a multiple of $\eta_4(0)$ in forward time. However, the orientation of this vector (i.e. whether that multiple is positive or negative) is difficult to ascertain, and it is what determines the sign of $D'(0)$. We will see that Maslov index can be used to circumvent this difficulty. Now for the proof of the Lemma.

Proof. Denote by $\Sigma(\lambda, z)$ the matrix in (4.3), and let $\Sigma(\lambda, z)^\#$ be its adjugate. By the Jacobi formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D'(0) &= -e^{2cz} \text{Trace}(\Sigma^\# \Sigma_\lambda)|_{\lambda=0}. \\ &= -\text{Trace} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\Omega(u_1, u_4) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \partial_\lambda \Omega(u_1, u_2) & \partial_\lambda \Omega(u_1, u_4) \\ \partial_\lambda \Omega(u_2, u_3) & \partial_\lambda \Omega(u_2, u_4) \end{bmatrix} \right) |_{\lambda=0} \\ &= \Omega(u_1, u_4) \partial_\lambda \Omega(u_2, u_3) |_{\lambda=0}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

It remains to calculate $\partial_\lambda \Omega(u_2, u_3)$. Since $\mu_2 + \mu_3 \equiv -c$, we can write $\Omega(u_2, u_3) = \omega(U, V)$, where $U = e^{-\mu_2(\lambda)z}u_2$ and $V = e^{-\mu_3(\lambda)z}u_3$, from which it follows that $\omega(U, V)$ is z -independent, and $\partial_\lambda \Omega(u_2, u_3) = \partial_\lambda \omega(U, V)$. Furthermore, U and V satisfy the equations

$$\begin{aligned} U_z &= (A(\lambda, z) - \mu_2(\lambda))U \\ V_z &= (A(\lambda, z) - \mu_3(\lambda))V. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Taking derivatives in λ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\lambda z} &= (A(\lambda, z) - \mu_2(\lambda))U_\lambda + (A_\lambda - \mu'_2(\lambda))U \\ V_{\lambda z} &= (A(\lambda, z) - \mu_3(\lambda))V_\lambda + (A_\lambda - \mu'_3(\lambda))V, \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$A_\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sigma} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\alpha} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.8)$$

is independent of z . Finally, since $\partial_z \omega(U, V) = 0$, $\partial_z \partial_\lambda \omega(U, V) = 0$ as well, so

$$\partial_z \omega(U_\lambda, V) = -\partial_z \omega(U, V_\lambda). \quad (4.9)$$

Using (4.7) and (4.6), we calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_z \omega(U_\lambda, V) &= \omega(A(\lambda, z)U_\lambda - \mu_2(\lambda)U_\lambda + A_\lambda U - \mu'_2(\lambda)U, V) \\ &\quad + \omega(U_\lambda, (A(\lambda, z) - \mu_3(\lambda))V) \\ &= -c\omega(U_\lambda, V) - (\mu_2(\lambda) + \mu_3(\lambda))\omega(U_\lambda, V) + \omega(A_\lambda U, V) - \mu'_2(\lambda)\omega(U, V) \\ &= \omega(A_\lambda U, V) - \mu'_2(\lambda)\omega(U, V). \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

In the second equality, we used the fact that

$$\omega(A(\lambda, z)v_1, v_2) + \omega(v_1, A(\lambda, z)v_2) = -c\omega(v_1, v_2) \quad (4.11)$$

for any z, λ and any vectors $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^4$. This yields the third equality in conjunction with the identity $\mu_2 + \mu_3 \equiv -c$. If we evaluate this expression at $\lambda = 0$, whence $U = e^{-\mu_2(0)z}\varphi'(z)$ and $V = e^{-\mu_3(0)z}\varphi'(z)$, we end up with

$$\partial_z \omega(U_\lambda, V)(0, z) = e^{cz}\omega(A_\lambda \varphi', \varphi') = -e^{cz} \left(\frac{(\hat{u}')^2}{\sigma} - \frac{(\hat{v}')^2}{\alpha} \right). \quad (4.12)$$

To complete the proof, we use the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus and (4.9), à la [30]. For any large $R, S > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(U_\lambda, V)(0, 0) &= \omega(U_\lambda, V)(0, R) + \int_0^R e^{cz} \left(\frac{(\hat{u}')^2}{\sigma} - \frac{(\hat{v}')^2}{\alpha} \right) \\ \omega(U, V_\lambda)(0, 0) &= \omega(U, V_\lambda)(0, -S) + \int_{-S}^0 e^{cz} \left(\frac{(\hat{u}')^2}{\sigma} - \frac{(\hat{v}')^2}{\alpha} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Adding these equations and taking $R, S \rightarrow \infty$ gives the desired result, provided that the boundary terms vanish in the limit. Since the limits in (2.22) are achieved uniformly on compact subsets of I , we have $U_\lambda \rightarrow \eta'_2(\lambda)$ and $V_\lambda \rightarrow \eta'_3(\lambda)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$ and as $z \rightarrow -\infty$ respectively. For $\lambda = 0$, it is clear that $V \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$ and that $U \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow -\infty$, so the boundary terms vanish by the linearity of ω , giving the result. $\square$

Having derived an expression for $D'(0)$, the task is now to determine its sign. To do so, we must understand the term $\Omega(u_1, u_4)$ from (4.4). The key to doing so is the Maslov index.

5. THE MASLOV INDEX AND DETECTION FORM

For any $\lambda \in I$, we know that the curve $z \mapsto E^u(\lambda, z)$ yields a curve in $\text{Gr}_2(\mathbb{R}^4)$. Following the discussion in §2 (specifically Theorem 1), it actually defines a curve in $\Lambda(2)$, the space of *Lagrangian* planes in $\mathbb{R}^4$. To any such curve, we can assign a half-integer invariant called the Maslov index. In [9], the Evans function is related to the Maslov index using a formulation of the latter due to Souriau [33]. This is defined for two elements in the universal cover of $\Lambda(2)$. Here, we opt for the more typical definition of the Maslov index, using intersections with the train of a fixed subspace.

This approach to defining the Maslov index for homoclinic orbits has its origins in [5, 10]. It was also used in [26] for periodic boundary value problems.

We now review the intersection definition of the Maslov index. This was introduced in [3], but we will need the improvement of [31], since there is necessarily an intersection at the right endpoint of the curve in our case due to translation invariance. Let $V \in \Lambda(2)$ be a fixed Lagrangian subspace. We can write $\Lambda(2)$ as the disjoint union of sets $\Sigma_k(V)$, $k = 0, 1, 2$, where k is the dimension of the intersection between V and any plane in $\Sigma_k(V)$. Each $\Sigma_k(V)$ is a submanifold of $\Lambda(2)$ of codimension $k(k+1)/2$. In particular, $\Sigma_2(V)$ contains only the plane V itself. It is not difficult to see that $\overline{\Sigma_1(V)} = \Sigma_1(V) \cup \Sigma_2(V)$. Following [25], this set is denoted $\mathcal{D}$ and called the *train* of V . In Arnol'd's work, this set is called the *singular cycle*.

The Maslov index is a count of how many times a curve $\gamma(z) \in \Lambda(2)$ intersects the set $\mathcal{D}$ defined by some fixed reference plane $V \in \Lambda(2)$. The intersections are weighted by a “crossing form,” which was introduced in [31] and will be discussed in more detail below. One of the assumptions we will make is that our curve has only regular crossings with the singular cycle. When the intersection is one-dimensional, this simply means that the crossing is transverse. For our purposes, the natural curve to consider is $z \mapsto E^u(0, z)$. The reference plane is taken to be $V = E^s(0, \tau_0)$, where τ_0 is large enough so that $W^u(0) \cap E^s(0, \tau) = \{0\}$ for all $\tau \geq \tau_0$. The reasons for choosing this reference plane will be explained later. We now elaborate on the crossing form and define the Maslov index.

Definition 3. $z^* \in \mathbb{R}$ is called a **crossing** (or *conjugate point*) if $E^u(0, z^*) \cap E^s(0, \tau_0) \neq \{0\}$. At a k -dimensional crossing z^* ($k = 1, 2$), there is a quadratic form

$$\Gamma(E^u, E^s(0, \tau_0); z^*)(\xi) = \omega(\xi, A(0, z^*)\xi), \quad (5.1)$$

defined on the intersection $E^u(0, z^*) \cap E^s(0, \tau_0)$. Γ is called the **crossing form**. A crossing z^* is called **regular** if Γ is nonsingular. If, in addition, $k = 1$, the crossing is called **simple**.

It is implicit in the preceding definition that Γ is derived from a symmetric bilinear form. Indeed, let z^* be a conjugate time, and consider the bilinear form $(v_1, v_2) \mapsto \omega(v_1, A(0, z^*)v_2)$ defined on $E^u(0, z^*) \cap E^s(0, \tau_0)$. Using (3.5) and the fact that $E^u(z)$ is Lagrangian for all z , we see that

$$\omega(v_1, A(0, z^*)v_2) - \omega(v_2, A(0, z^*)v_1) = \frac{d}{dz}\omega(v_1, v_2) = -c\omega(v_1, v_2) = 0, \quad (5.2)$$

as desired. In order to define the Maslov index, it still needs to be shown that this crossing form is equivalent to the one developed in [31]. This is the content of the following theorem.

Theorem 3. *The crossing form Γ in (5.1) is well-defined. In other words, the Maslov index defined by this crossing form is equivalent to the Maslov index in [31], and consequently it enjoys the same properties.*

Proof. Suppose that z^* is a conjugate point. Take $W \in \Lambda(2)$ such that $E^u(z^*) \oplus W = \mathbb{R}^4$. It is well known [14] that any other Lagrangian subspace transverse to W can be written uniquely as the graph of a linear operator $A : E^u(0, z^*) \rightarrow W$. In particular, for $|z - z^*| < \delta \ll 1$,

$$E^u(0, z) = \{v + \psi(z)v : v \in E^u(0, z^*)\} \quad (5.3)$$

with $\psi(z) : E^u(0, z^*) \rightarrow W$ smooth in z . For any $\xi \in E^u(0, z^*) \cap E^s(0, \tau_0)$, we therefore have a curve $w(z) \in W$ defined by $\xi + w(z) \in E^u(0, z)$, or, equivalently, $w(z) = \psi(z)\xi$. Furthermore, we have $\psi(z^*) = 0$. It is shown in [31] that the form

$$Q(\xi) = \frac{d}{dz}\Big|_{z=z^*} \omega(\xi, w(z)) \quad (5.4)$$

is independent of the choice of W and defines the crossing form. It therefore suffices to show that we can recover (5.1) from (5.4). To that end, it will be helpful to consider the evolution operator

$\Phi(\zeta, z)$ for (2.6) with $\lambda = 0$. Φ satisfies $\Phi(\zeta, \zeta) = \text{Id}$ and $\Phi(z^*, z) \cdot E^u(0, z^*) = E^u(0, z)$. Notice that (5.3) defines a curve $\gamma(z) \in E^u(0, z^*)$ by the formula

$$\xi + \psi(z)\xi = \Phi(z^*, z)\gamma(z). \quad (5.5)$$

From above, $\gamma(z^*) = \xi$. We are now ready to compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dz} \Big|_{z=z^*} \omega(\xi, w(z)) &= \frac{d}{dz} \Big|_{z=z^*} \omega(\xi, \Phi(z^*, z)\gamma(z) - \xi) \\ &= \frac{d}{dz} \Big|_{z=z^*} \omega(\xi, \Phi(z^*, z)\gamma(z)) \\ &= \omega(\xi, A(0, z^*)\gamma(z^*)) + \omega(\xi, \gamma'(z^*)) \\ &= \omega(\xi, A(0, z^*)\xi) + \lim_{z \rightarrow z^*} \frac{1}{z - z^*} \omega(\xi, \gamma(z) - \gamma(z^*)) \\ &= \omega(\xi, A(0, z^*)\xi). \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

The last equality follows since $\gamma(z) \in E^u(z^*)$ for all z , which is a Lagrangian plane containing ξ . This completes the proof. $\square$

We are now able to define the Maslov index for the unstable bundle. We stress that the index depends on the choice of reference plane.

Definition 4. Let $\tau_0 \gg 1$ be as above. The **Maslov index** of the path $(-\infty, \tau_0] \rightarrow E^u(0, z)$ with respect to the plane $E^s(0, \tau_0)$ is given by

$$\mu(E^u, E^s(0, \tau_0)) := \sum_{z^* \in (a, b)} \text{sign } \Gamma(E^u, E^s(0, \tau_0), z^*) + \frac{1}{2} \text{sign } \Gamma(E^u, E^s(0, \tau_0), \tau_0), \quad (5.7)$$

where the sum is taken over all of the crossings of $E^u(0, z)$ with $\mathcal{D}$, the train of $E^s(0, \tau_0)$.

The natural choice of reference plane would seem to be $W^s(0)$. This is problematic, however, because we know that $E^u(0, z)$ approaches the train of $W^s(0)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$; φ' spans the intersection in the limit. The crossing form would have to approach 0, so it would be impossible to determine the sign of this final crossing. The idea of pulling back $W^s(0)$ slightly to $E^s(0, \tau_0)$ is due to Chen and Hu, see [10]. Using the properties of the Maslov index derived in §2 of [31], they prove that the Maslov index given by (5.7) is independent of τ_0 . We therefore drop the subscript on τ for the rest of the discussion. This strategy also forces an intersection at the right endpoint $z = \tau$. If the wave is transversely constructed, this intersection will be one-dimensional, so we can see from (5.7) that $\mu(E^u, E^s(0, \tau)) = k + 1/2$, for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. This motivates the following definition for the Maslov index of the homoclinic orbit φ .

$$\text{Maslov}(\varphi) = \mu(E^u, E^s(0, \tau)) + \frac{1}{2}. \quad (5.8)$$

The rest of this section is dedicated to proving the formula

$$(-1)^{\text{Maslov}(\varphi)+1} = \text{sign } \Omega(u_1, u_4). \quad (5.9)$$

The reader will notice that the sign convention is reversed from the main result in [9]. This is due to the ordering of the basis for $E^s(0, z)$. They take φ' to be the first basis vector, whereas we take it to be the second, following the ordering of the eigenvalues. This has no affect on the Maslov index, which is defined for non-oriented planes. However, it does reverse the sign of the Lazutkin-Treschev invariant. We will indicate where this is manifested in the proof below.

To calculate the Maslov index, we must have a way of finding conjugate points. This is accomplished through the introduction of the *detection form* $\pi \in \Lambda^2(\mathbb{R}^4)^*$, defined by

$$\pi(w_1 \wedge w_2) = \det \left[e^{-\mu_1(0)\tau} u_1(0, \tau), e^{-\mu_2(0)\tau} u_2(0, \tau), w_1, w_2 \right]. \quad (5.10)$$

π is called the detection form because it is 0 precisely when the plane $W = \text{sp}\{w_1, w_2\}$ intersects $E^s(0, \tau)$ nontrivially. This form is traditionally called the dual to the characterizing two-vector $w_1 \wedge w_2$ for W , see [13]. We next define a function $\beta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which evaluates π on $E^u(0, z)$. Explicitly, we have

$$\beta(z) = e^{-(\mu_1 + \mu_2)\tau - (\mu_3 + \mu_4)z} \det[u_1(\tau), u_2(\tau), u_3(z), u_4(z)]. \quad (5.11)$$

We henceforth suppress the dependence of u_i, μ_i on λ , since we take $\lambda = 0$ for this calculation. For brevity, we also set $M(z) = -(\mu_1 + \mu_2)\tau - (\mu_3 + \mu_4)z$. Recall that $u_2 = u_3 = \varphi'$ for $\lambda = 0$, so we see immediately that $\beta(\tau) = 0$, since columns two and three are both $\varphi'(\tau)$.

Now, we can use (4.2) to rewrite β as

$$\beta(z) = -e^{M(z)} \det \begin{bmatrix} \omega(u_1(\tau), u_3(z)) & \omega(u_1(\tau), u_4(z)) \\ \omega(u_2(\tau), u_3(z)) & \omega(u_2(\tau), u_4(z)) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.12)$$

The next ingredient is $\beta'(\tau)$, whose sign we claim will help determine the sign of $D'(0)$. Since $\beta(\tau) = 0$, we see that

$$\beta'(\tau) = -e^{M(\tau)} \frac{d}{dz} [\omega(u_1(\tau), u_3(z))\omega(u_2(\tau), u_4(z)) - \omega(u_1(\tau), u_4(z))\omega(u_2(\tau), u_3(z))] \Big|_{z=\tau} \quad (5.13)$$

Before jumping into the product rule expansion, recall that $u_2(\tau) = u_3(\tau) = \varphi'(\tau)$, and hence $\text{sp}\{u_i(\tau), u_j(\tau)\}$ is Lagrangian for $(i, j) = (1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 4), (3, 4)$, with $\omega(u_2, u_3) = 0$ as well. It follows that the only surviving term is $-\omega(u_1(\tau), u_4(\tau))\omega(u_2(\tau), u_3'(\tau))$. Since $M(\tau) = -(\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3 + \mu_4)\tau = 2c\tau$, we conclude that

$$\beta'(\tau) = \Omega(u_1, u_4)\Omega(\varphi'(\tau), \varphi''(\tau)). \quad (5.14)$$

The relation to (4.4) is now apparent. Noticing that $\varphi'' = A(0, z)\varphi'$, the second term in (5.14) is the crossing form for the conjugate point $z = \tau$, scaled by a positive factor $e^{c\tau}$. We will show that the sign of $\Omega(u_1, u_4)$ can be determined from the Maslov index, regardless of the sign of the crossing at $z = \tau$. The tie that binds the two is $\beta(z)$. First, from (5.11) we can see β is asymptotically constant as $z \rightarrow -\infty$. Indeed, if τ is large enough, then (3.11) and (3.12) imply that

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow -\infty} \beta(z) \approx \det[\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, \eta_4], \quad (5.15)$$

where each vector is evaluated at $\lambda = 0$. The determinant in (5.15) can be calculated most easily by using (4.2) along with the eigenvector definitions (2.20). Since $\omega(\eta_1, \eta_3) = \omega(\eta_2, \eta_4) = 0$, this reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \det[\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, \eta_4] &= \omega(\eta_1, \eta_4)\omega(\eta_2, \eta_3) \\ &= -\sigma\alpha^3(\mu_4 - \mu_1)(\mu_3 - \mu_2)\Delta < 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

Thus $\beta(z) < 0$ for large, negative z , provided τ is large enough. Using the ordering of [9], η_1 and η_2 would be switched in (5.15), which would make β positive for $z \ll 0$. It will be clear from the following argument why this is responsible for the difference in sign. By definition, zeros of β correspond to conjugate points for the curve $E^u(0, z)$. Heuristically, the sign of $\beta'(\tau)$ is positive if there are an even number of conjugate points (excluding τ) and negative if there are an odd number of conjugate points. Since the Maslov index, roughly speaking, counts the number of conjugate points, its parity should therefore determine the sign of $\beta'(\tau)$.

To make the preceding precise, we must know a few things about zeros of β and the Maslov index. First, since an intersection of $E^u(0, z)$ with $E^s(0, \tau)$ can be one- or two-dimensional, the contribution to the Maslov index at any (interior) conjugate point is $-2, -1, 0, 1$, or 2 . Since the

parity of the index is unchanged if the contribution is even, we need β to cross through the z -axis if and only if the crossing is one-dimensional. Obviously, we also need β to have finitely many zeros for this to make sense. The latter is true if we assume that there are only regular crossings, which is an assumption needed to define the Maslov index for non-loops in the first place, see [31]. It turns out that the assumption of regularity is also sufficient for the former. This is the content of the next two lemmas.

Lemma 4. *If z^* is a conjugate point such that the intersection $E^u(0, z^*) \cap E^s(0, \tau) = \text{sp}\{\xi\}$ is one-dimensional, then the crossing is regular if and only if $\beta'(z^*) \neq 0$.*

Proof. Let $\xi = \beta_1 u_1(\tau) + \beta_2 u_2(\tau)$ be a vector in the intersection. Let ν be a second basis vector for $E^u(0, z^*)$. As noted in §4 of [9], $\omega(u_i(\tau), \nu) \neq 0$ ($i = 1, 2$), else we would have $\nu \in E^s(0, z^*)$, violating the assumption that the intersection is one-dimensional. Changing to the basis $\{\xi, \nu\}$ of $E^u(0, z^*)$ would introduce a nonzero multiple in the expression for $\beta(\tau)$, which we call B . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta'(z^*) &= B e^{M(z^*)} \{ \det[u_1(\tau), u_2(\tau), A(0, z^*)\xi, \nu] + \det[u_1(\tau), u_2(\tau), \xi, A(0, z^*)\nu] \} \\ &= B e^{M(z^*)} \det[u_1(\tau), u_2(\tau), A(0, z^*)\xi, \nu] \\ &= -B e^{M(z^*)} \det \begin{bmatrix} \omega(u_1(\tau), A(0, z^*)\xi) & \omega(u_1(\tau), \nu) \\ \omega(u_2(\tau), A(0, z^*)\xi) & \omega(u_2(\tau), \nu) \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.17)$$

Since $\text{sp}\{\xi, \nu\}$ is a Lagrangian plane, we have

$$0 = \omega(\xi, \nu) = \beta_1 \omega(u_1(\tau), \nu) + \beta_2 \omega(u_2(\tau), \nu). \quad (5.18)$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume $\beta_2 \neq 0$, and hence $\omega(u_2(\tau), \nu) = -\frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2} \omega(u_1(\tau), \nu)$. Returning to (5.17), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta'(z^*) &= -B e^{M(z^*)} \left\{ -\frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2} \omega(u_1(\tau), A(0, z^*)\xi) \omega(u_1(\tau), \nu) - \omega(u_2(\tau), A(0, z^*)\xi) \omega(u_1(\tau), \nu) \right\} \\ &= \frac{B}{\beta_2} e^{M(z^*)} \omega(u_1(\tau), \nu) \omega(\beta_1 u_1(\tau) + \beta_2 u_2(\tau), A(0, z^*)\xi) \\ &= \frac{B}{\beta_2} \omega(u_1(\tau), \nu) e^{M(z^*)} \omega(\xi, A(0, z^*)\xi). \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

Comparing with (5.1), it's now clear that the crossing is regular if and only if $\beta'(z^*) \neq 0$. $\square$

Lemma 5. *If z^* is a conjugate point such that the intersection $E^u(0, z^*) \cap E^s(0, \tau)$ is two-dimensional, then the following are true:*

- (1) $\beta'(z^*) = 0$.
- (2) $\beta''(z^*) \neq 0 \iff$ the crossing at τ is regular.

Proof. Immediately we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta'(z^*) &= e^{M(z^*)} \{ \det[u_1(\tau), u_2(\tau), A(0, z^*)u_3(z^*), u_4(z^*)] + \det[u_1(\tau), u_2(\tau), u_3(z^*), A(0, z^*)u_4(z^*)] \} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

since there is linear dependence in the first, second and fourth (resp. first, second and third) columns in the matrix on the left (resp. right). In a similar way, the second derivative is seen to be

$$\beta''(z^*) = 2e^{M(z^*)} \det[u_1(\tau), u_2(\tau), A(0, z^*)u_3(z^*), A(0, z^*)u_4(z^*)] \quad (5.21)$$

Next, since the crossing is two-dimensional, we have $\text{sp}\{u_1(\tau), u_2(\tau)\} = \text{sp}\{u_3(z^*), u_4(z^*)\}$, so by some change of basis in the first two columns of (5.21), we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}\beta''(z^*) &= 2Be^{M(z^*)} \det[u_3(z^*), u_4(z^*), A(0, z^*)u_3(z^*), A(0, z^*)u_4(z^*)] \\ &= -2Be^{M(z^*)} \det \begin{bmatrix} \omega(u_3(z^*), A(0, z^*)u_3(z^*)) & \omega(u_3(z^*), A(0, z^*)u_4(z^*)) \\ \omega(u_4(z^*), A(0, z^*)u_3(z^*)) & \omega(u_4(z^*), A(0, z^*)u_4(z^*)) \end{bmatrix},\end{aligned}\quad (5.22)$$

using (4.2). The symplectic version of the matrix in (5.22) is exactly the matrix of the crossing form Γ in the basis $\{u_3(z^*), u_4(z^*)\}$ for $E^s(0, \tau) \cap E^u(0, z^*)$. To say that the crossing is regular then is to say that this matrix does not have zero as an eigenvalue. Since the determinant of this matrix is the product of the eigenvalues, the Lemma follows. $\square$

These lemmas allow us to conclude the following: consider the curve $\gamma(z)$, which is $E^u(0, z)$ restricted to an interval $(-\infty, \tau - \epsilon)$ containing all conjugate points prior to τ . Then

$$\mu(\gamma, E^s(0, \tau)) \text{ is even} \iff \beta'(\tau) > 0. \quad (5.23)$$

In other words, since $\beta(\tau) = 0$, the direction in which $\beta(z)$ crosses through 0 at τ is completely determined by how many times $\beta(z)$ passed through the z -axis prior to τ .

To calculate $\mu(E^u, E^s(0, \tau))$, one would need to know the direction of the final crossing, i.e. the sign of $\omega(\varphi'(\tau), \varphi''(\tau))$. However, this is *not* needed to prove (5.9). First, assume that $\text{Maslov}(\varphi)$ is even. There are now two possibilities regarding the final crossing at $z = \tau$. If $\omega(\varphi'(\tau), \varphi''(\tau)) > 0$, then this crossing contributes $+1/2$ to the index, which means that there were an odd number of weighted crossings prior to τ : $(\text{odd} + 1/2) + 1/2 = \text{even}$. (In the above notation, $\mu(\gamma, E^s(0, \tau))$ is odd.) Thus $\beta'(\tau) < 0$, from which we conclude that $\Omega(u_1, u_4) < 0$, using (5.14).

On the other hand, if $\omega(\varphi'(\tau), \varphi''(\tau)) < 0$, then there must be an even number of weighted crossings prior to τ , since the last crossing contributes $-1/2$, so

$$2k = \text{Maslov}(\varphi) = \mu(E^u(0, z), E^s(0, \tau)) + 1/2 = (\mu(\gamma(z), E^s(0, \tau)) - 1/2) + 1/2.$$

This implies that $\beta'(\tau) > 0$. Again using (5.14), we see that $\Omega(u_1, u_4) < 0$, showing that its sign does not depend on the direction of the final crossing. An analogous argument shows that $\Omega(u_1, u_4) > 0$ if and only if $\text{Maslov}(\varphi)$ is odd. This proves the formula (5.9).

6. APPLICATION

The paradigmatic activator-inhibitor system is the famous FitzHugh-Nagumo equation (FHN), which we obtain by taking

$$f(u) = u(1 - u)(u - a), \sigma = 1, \alpha = \epsilon \text{ and } g(v) = -\epsilon\gamma v \quad (6.1)$$

in (1.1). Typically, ϵ is taken to be very small, making this a singular perturbation problem. Furthermore, a satisfies $0 < a < 1/2$. The stability of various traveling and standing fronts and pulses has been studied for the variation of this equation in which there is either no diffusion on v , or the diffusion coefficient is a small parameter, for example [24, 15, 1]. For the case of equal diffusivities, a stability result for standing waves is obtained in [11].

In a companion paper [12], we prove that (1.1) with the nonlinearity given above possesses “fast” traveling wave solutions for $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. The wave is constructed using techniques of geometric singular perturbation theory. As in the no-diffusion case, it can be shown that the only potential point-spectrum in the right half-plane is an eigenvalue near zero, which must be real. It therefore suffices to consider $D'(0)$ to show whether this eigenvalue is positive or negative. Using the result of this paper, we show that the eigenvalue is indeed negative and hence that the wave is nonlinearly stable. Although the full existence and stability proofs are beyond the scope, we can give a taste of the Maslov index calculation that is instrumental to the stability result.

Written as a first-order system, the traveling wave equation for FHN is

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \\ w \\ y \end{pmatrix}_z = \begin{pmatrix} w \\ \epsilon y \\ -cw - f(u) + v \\ -cy + \gamma v - u \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6.2)$$

This is a fast-slow system with three fast variables (u, w, y) and one slow variable v . There is a one-dimensional critical manifold M_0 given by

$$M_0 = \{(u, v, w, y) : v = f(u), w = 0, y = \frac{1}{c}(\gamma v - u)\}, \quad (6.3)$$

which is normally hyperbolic wherever $f'(u) \neq 0$. The limiting slow flow on M_0 is given by

$$\dot{v} = y = \frac{1}{c}(\gamma v - f^{-1}(v)), \quad (6.4)$$

where f^{-1} is defined separately on three segments of the cubic $v = f(u)$, divided by the two zeros of $f'(u)$. Of particular interest are the two outer branches corresponding to the intervals on which $f(u)$ is strictly decreasing. We call these M_0^L and M_0^R for the left and right branches respectively. As in the case with no diffusion on v , it can be shown that there is a singular homoclinic orbit to $(0, 0, 0, 0)$ consisting of alternating fast and slow pieces. Specifically, there is a value of $c < 0$ such that a heteroclinic connection exists from $(u, v, w, y) = (0, 0, 0, 0)$ on M_0^L to $(u, v, w, y) = (1, 0, 0, -1/c)$ on M_0^R . From there, the slow flow carries us up M_0^R to a point $(f^{-1}(v^*), v^*, 0, (1/c)(\gamma v^* - f^{-1}(v^*)))$ at which another heteroclinic connection exists back to M_0^L . After making this fast jump back to M_0^L , the orbit is closed up by the slow flow returning to $(0, 0, 0, 0)$. The Exchange Lemma applies, and we conclude that this singular orbit perturbs to a solution φ of (6.2) with $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$.

The main task in [12] is to show that this wave is stable. We do so by calculating $\text{Maslov}(\varphi)$ and applying (5.9). The timescale separation in this problem is what allows us to calculate the Maslov index. Typically, this is difficult to do, because tracking the second spanning vector in the unstable bundle is challenging. However, using the reduced equations makes it tractable. For example, we can easily follow the unstable bundle $E^u(0, z)$ along the fast jumps, because the y -direction in the fast subsystem

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ w \\ y \end{pmatrix}_z = \begin{pmatrix} w \\ -cw + v - f(u) \\ -cy + \gamma v - u \end{pmatrix} \quad (6.5)$$

decouples. The equilibrium $(0, 0, 0)$ of (6.5) has two unstable directions and one stable direction. By standard Fenichel theory, the unstable manifold $W_\epsilon^u(0)$ of 0 with $\epsilon \neq 0$ is $O(\epsilon)$ close to $W_0^u(0)$, which we can describe easily. Since y does not appear in the equations for u and w , the u - and w -components of the fast jump are the same as in the wave found by McKean [28]. The y -direction is invariant, so $W_0^u(0)$ becomes a cylinder over this orbit in the (u, w) -plane. To calculate the Maslov index, we need to detect intersections with $E^s(0, \tau)$ for large τ .

As is seen from (6.4), the slow direction becomes stable when $\epsilon \neq 0$. Nonetheless, the stable manifold $W_\epsilon^s(0)$ has a smooth limit, which is the direct sum of the stable direction in (6.5) and the tangent vector to M_0^L . We call this subspace $W_0^s(0)$. By general position arguments, it follows that we can calculate the contribution to the Maslov index along the fast jump by detecting intersections of the $\epsilon = 0$ objects, provided that the latter are transverse. Using (5.10), a calculation gives that the two-form π defining the train of $W_0^s(0)$ is

$$\pi = \frac{a\mu_1}{c} \left(\gamma + \frac{1}{a} \right) p_{12} - \mu_1 p_{13} - a\mu_1 p_{14} + \left\{ \frac{1}{c} \left(\gamma + \frac{1}{a} \right) - \frac{\mu_1}{a} \right\} p_{23} - \mu_1 p_{24} + a p_{34}, \quad (6.6)$$

where μ_1 is the stable eigenvalue for the fixed point 0 of (6.5). The formula for β simplifies this dramatically, since $p_{12} = p_{13} = p_{23} = p_{24} = 0$ along the fast jump with $\epsilon = 0$. Substituting these values, we see that z is a conjugate point if and only if

$$0 = -a\mu_1 p_{14} + a p_{34}, \quad (6.7)$$

which is to say that

$$\mu_1 p_{14} = p_{34}. \quad (6.8)$$

These six equations determine a unique plane, which is

$$V = \text{sp} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \mu_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}. \quad (6.9)$$

Since the y -direction is invariant, the question is thus whether the ratio w_z/u_z is equal to μ_1 anywhere along the fast jump. A quick look at the wave in the (u, w) -plane confirms that this happens exactly one time. Indeed, the heteroclinic connection approaches $(1, 0)$ asymptotically tangent to the stable eigenvector, for which the same ratio ρ satisfies

$$\rho < \mu_1 < 0. \quad (6.10)$$

Since this ratio is monotone decreasing along the orbit, the existence of unique conjugate point follows. To calculate the contribution to the Maslov index, we note that

$$V \cap W_0^s(0) = \text{sp} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ 0 \\ a\mu_1 \\ -\mu_1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}. \quad (6.11)$$

The direction of this crossing is determined using the crossing form (5.1)

$$\omega(\xi, A(0, z)\xi) = -f'(u)a^2 - c\mu_1 a^2 - a^2 \mu_1^2 = -a^2 [\mu_1^2 + c\mu_1 + f'(u)] = -a^2 [a + f'(u)], \quad (6.12)$$

where ξ is the basis for $V \cap W_0^s(0)$ given in (6.11). Using the equations for u and w from [28], it can be shown that $a + f'(u) = 1/4 - a^2 > 0$, hence the crossing is negative. This means that the contribution to the Maslov index is -1 along the fast jump.

A similar calculation gives the contribution to the Maslov index along the back (i.e. the second fast piece). The difficulty lies in determining the contribution to the Maslov index as we move near the slow manifold. Since the Maslov index is additive by catenation, we can find $\text{Maslov}(\varphi)$ by adding the constituent indices together, and from there determine the stability of the wave. It is interesting to note that this calculation would avoid factoring the Evans function into fast and slow pieces, as is often done in such problems. Furthermore, we do not need to take a derivative with respect to the speed parameter to calculate $D'(0)$.

REFERENCES

1. J. Alexander, R.A. Gardner, and C.K.R.T. Jones, *A topological invariant arising in the stability analysis of travelling waves*, J. reine angew. Math **410** (1990), no. 167-212, 143.
2. J.C. Alexander and C.K.R.T. Jones, *Existence and stability of asymptotically oscillatory double pulses*, J. reine angew. Math **446** (1994), 49-79.
3. Vladimir Igorevich Arnol'd, *Characteristic class entering in quantization conditions*, Functional Analysis and its applications **1** (1967), no. 1, 1-13.
4. Peter W. Bates and Christopher K.R.T. Jones, *Invariant manifolds for semilinear partial differential equations*, Dynamics reported, Springer, 1989, pp. 1-38.
5. Amitabha Bose and Christopher K.R.T. Jones, *Stability of the in-phase travelling wave solution in a pair of coupled nerve fibers*, Indiana University Mathematics Journal **44** (1995), no. 1, 189-220.

6. Thomas J. Bridges and Gianne Derks, *Unstable eigenvalues and the linearization about solitary waves and fronts with symmetry*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, vol. 455, The Royal Society, no. 1987, 1999, pp. 2427–2469.
7. ———, *The symplectic Evans matrix, and the instability of solitary waves and fronts*, Archive for rational mechanics and analysis **156** (2001), no. 1, 1–87.
8. ———, *Constructing the symplectic Evans matrix using maximally analytic individual vectors*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh: Section A Mathematics **133** (2003), no. 03, 505–526.
9. Frédéric Chardard and Thomas J. Bridges, *Transversality of homoclinic orbits, the Maslov index and the symplectic Evans function*, Nonlinearity **28** (2014), no. 1, 77.
10. Chao-Nien Chen and Xijun Hu, *Maslov index for homoclinic orbits of Hamiltonian systems*, Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, vol. 24, Analyse non Linéaire, no. 4, 2007, pp. 589–603.
11. ———, *Stability analysis for standing pulse solutions to FitzHugh–Nagumo equations*, Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations **49** (2014), no. 1-2, 827–845.
12. P. Cornwell and C.K.R.T. Jones, *On the existence and stability of fast traveling waves in a doubly-diffusive FitzHugh–Nagumo system*, In preparation.
13. Mike Crampin and Felix A.E. Pirani, *Applicable differential geometry*, vol. 59, Cambridge University Press, 1986.
14. J.J. Duistermaat, *Symplectic geometry*, Spring School, June 7-14, 2004.
15. Gilberto Flores, *Stability analysis for the slow travelling pulse of the FitzHugh–Nagumo system*, SIAM journal on mathematical analysis **22** (1991), no. 2, 392–399.
16. Robert Gardner and Christopher K.R.T. Jones, *Stability of travelling wave solutions of diffusive predator-prey systems*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **327** (1991), no. 2, 465–524.
17. Robert A. Gardner and Kevin Zumbrun, *The gap lemma and geometric criteria for instability of viscous shock profiles*, Communications on pure and applied mathematics **51** (1998), no. 7, 797–855.
18. Brendan Hassett, *Introduction to algebraic geometry*, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
19. Dan Henry, *Geometric theory of semilinear parabolic equations*, Lecture notes in mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1981.
20. Ale Jan Homburg and Björn Sandstede, *Homoclinic and heteroclinic bifurcations in vector fields*, Handbook of dynamical systems **3** (2010), 379–524.
21. Peter Howard, Yuri Latushkin, and Alim Sukhtayev, *The Maslov and Morse indices for Schrödinger operators on $\mathbb{R}$* , arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.05692 (2016).
22. Peter Howard and Alim Sukhtayev, *The Maslov and Morse indices for Schrödinger operators on $[0, 1]$* , Journal of Differential Equations **260** (2016), no. 5, 4499–4549.
23. Christopher Jones, Yuri Latushkin, and Selim Sukhtaiev, *Counting spectrum via the Maslov index for one dimensional θ -periodic Schrödinger operators*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **145** (2017), no. 1, 363–377.
24. Christopher K.R.T. Jones, *Stability of the travelling wave solution of the FitzHugh–Nagumo system*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **286** (1984), no. 2, 431–469.
25. ———, *Instability of standing waves for non-linear Schrödinger-type equations*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **8** (1988), no. 8*, 119–138.
26. Christopher K.R.T. Jones, Yuri Latushkin, and Robert Marangell, *The Morse and Maslov indices for matrix Hills equations*, Spectral analysis, differential equations and mathematical physics: a festschrift in honor of Fritz Gesztesy’s 60th birthday **87** (2013), 205–233.
27. Tosio Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Springer, 1966.
28. Henry P. McKean, *Nagumo’s equation*, Advances in mathematics **4** (1970), no. 3, 209–223.
29. James D. Murray, *Mathematical biology. ii spatial models and biomedical applications*, Springer-Verlag New York Incorporated, 2001.
30. Robert L. Pego and Michael I. Weinstein, *Eigenvalues, and instabilities of solitary waves*, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences **340** (1992), no. 1656, 47–94.
31. Joel Robbin and Dietmar Salamon, *The Maslov index for paths*, Topology **32** (1993), no. 4, 827–844.
32. Björn Sandstede, *Stability of travelling waves*, Handbook of dynamical systems **2** (2002), 983–1055.
33. Jean-Marie Souriau, *Construction explicite de l’indice de Maslov. Applications*, Group theoretical methods in physics, Springer, 1976, pp. 117–148.
34. A.M. Turing, *The chemical basis of morphogenesis*, Bulletin of mathematical biology **52** (1990), no. 1-2, 153–197.
35. Ernest Borisovich Vinberg, *A course in algebra*, no. 56, American Mathematical Soc., 2003.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNC CHAPEL HILL, PHILLIPS HALL CB #3250, CHAPEL HILL, NC 27516

E-mail address: `ckrtj@email.unc.edu`